

Date: Wed, 7 Jul 93 04:30:24 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #218
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 7 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 218

Today's Topics:

 Give a VE \$5.60, walk
Give a VE \$5.60, walk out with a ham license... (2 msgs)
 Repeater coordination, complaints?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 7 Jul 1993 02:01:56 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

gary.gabriel@pcohio.com (Gary Gabriel) writes:

>
> PWSK>I trust you will take the time to provide some carefully-worded comments
> PWSK>to the FCC regarding your opinions, or are you just blowing hot air
> PWSK>again (like your recent proposal to petition the FCC to repeal the
> PWSK>no-code license)?
>
> PWSK>73, Paul W. Schleck, KD3FU
>
> Good for you ! The "abolish no code" people out there are the same people
> that wanted us all to use blinkyterm for FIDOnet. It's called a weenie filte
> r.

Give it a break. Real bbs's don't carry FidoNet (Just saying that name

makes me wanna blow chunks). As for weenie filters, then so be it.
That's what kill files on Usenet are for. :)

> Pardon my language but I think weenie filters are for weenies. If the person
> can pass the test then she/he should be able to get on the air (conditionally
>)
> right away. Our time would be better spent if we were to "adopt a newbie"
> rather than bash one. Until node-code tech Amateur Radio was on the decline.

And now we're saturated, the numbers aren't really going up as fast and neither are upgrades. What we did with the no-code license was to create a class of hams who never had any exposure to the code, and as a result they'll be doing our bidding for us now. Really swift move if you ask me.

> Do we want to go back to those days !

No, but we sure as hell should change the days we're living in now!

> ---
> ~ OLX 2.1 TD ~ Oh I'd hate to be an Oscar Meyer Weenie Filter...

I simply can't imagine being forced to read a Usenet group through an offline mail-reader... Bleeeeaaahhh!

Date: Tue, 6 Jul 93 17:56:15 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!lkollar@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk out with a ham license...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, mike@ns.risc.net (Mike) writes:

>I'm surprised nobody caught on to this one, which was posted as part
>of the Amateur Radio Newsline recently:

Maybe because everyone else reads a bit more carefully. :-)

>> "The FCC has proposed that a temporary callsign be issued to
>> new applicants. This temporary callsign would be issued at the
>> test session when the applicant has passed the required elements.
~~~~~

>Why don't we make it even easier. Just include a free ham license  
>with every ham radio you purchase.  
>[blah blah etc]

I don't get it. If you come in and \*PASS\* \*THE\* \*REQUIRED\* \*ELEMENTS\* you get a temporary callsign to use the privileges you \*\*\*earned\*\*\* until you get your "real" call.

Is the CSCE system a Bad Thing? It works the same way -- if you pass the proper elements, you get the operating privileges. I passed the Advanced elements last year, and signed as KC4WZK/AA while operating in the Advanced subbands until I got my new license.

I see no problem here. It'll be no easier to pass the tests after this is in place than it was before. You just don't have to wait 7 weeks after you pass to start operating.

(I can see the FCC's motive here though: if it goes though, the pressure is off them to speed up the process. They can drag it out for 10 or 12 weeks and who cares anymore? 'Course, if we started paying for our licenses, maybe they could afford a better system....)

--

Larry Kollar, KC4WZK | 'finger lkollar' for ham-related interests.  
lkollar@nyx.cs.du.edu | "Didn't vote for the lottery - won't play it."  
"[The media] tore down Bush, now they're trying to tear down Clinton.  
Are they trying to destroy the presidency?" - Barry Goldwater

---

Date: Tue, 6 Jul 1993 19:46:31 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csli!  
paulf@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk out with a ham license...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <1993Jul6.042454.7553@serval.net.wsu.edu> i7994779@wsuaix.csc.wsu.edu (Patrick D. Walters;S10000) writes:

>I am sorry, but I don't see what's wrong with this. All the FCC does is spend  
>2 months doing the paperwork. They don't do anything more than verify what  
>the VE did. I think it would a great system. As it is now, you pass your test  
>but you still not a HAM until you get your call. Temp calls would be instant  
>reward for a lot of studying. What's the difference between this and upgrade  
>temp callsigns?

I can see at least three things wrong with this proposal.

First of all, the obvious potential for abuse. How is a monitoring station to determine if a "temp" callsign is actually legit or not? There's also the problem of suspended licensees from both the amateur and other services, who are not eligible to hold an amateur license -- this check is made on all initial licensees, which is why it tends to take a bit longer for your first 610 to be processed.

Secondly, the waiting period serves a very useful purpose. It forces a new licensee to \*listen\* to the practice of amateur radio before they can transmit, in order to learn how it's done. A period of a few weeks allows for a sampling of many different operating styles. There is, of course, a limit to this as well (probably 3-4 weeks).

Finally, though, it's most likely that electronic filing of 610s will make this all moot. The FCC will still need to check to make sure that you don't have a suspension, and print the license, but that need not take more than about two weeks.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----

Date: Tue, 06 Jul 93 08:05:28 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
europia.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!rsiatl!jgd@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Repeater coordination, complaints?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

bobw@col.hp.com (Bob Witte) writes:

>The net immediately spewed forth with all kinds of valuable advice :-(  
>and the discussion went like this:

[effluvia deleted.]

Bob, so glad to see you could add something constructive to the conversation.  
You must be an Extra.

John

--

John De Armond, WD4OQC | (Pardon the inconvenience while we  
Performance Engineering Magazine(TM) | remodel this .signature)  
Marietta, Ga |  
jgd@dixie.com |

-----

Date: Tue, 6 Jul 1993 17:49:46 GMT  
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!  
fc.hp.com!jayk@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul2.183852.4804@Csli.Stanford.EDU>, <C9K996.7vL@fc.hp.com>, <1993Jul5.173752.2003@Csli.Stanford.EDU>

Reply-To : jayk@fc.hp.com

Subject : Re: NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas

Warning this is kind of long :-)

Paul Flaherty, N9FZX

>>Going from 30-60' nets you  
>>between 3-5 db(with 4db S units, that's about one S unit). Going from 60'  
>>to 90' buys you about 2db more. So, it really doesn't pay to go above 60',  
>>for most environments.

I wrote:

>On 10 meters going from 30' to 60' will  
>generally not make a great deal of difference. On 20 meters it will make  
>much more of a difference and on DX paths can produce a lot more than one  
>S unit (which is usually considered 6 db??). With a 40 meter horizontal  
>yagi it will make a huge difference! If your in to DXing, a 20 or 40 meter  
>yagi really starts to play well at about 90 feet.

Paul Flaherty, N9FZX

>>2. What is the effect of moving a horizontal radiator higher?  
>>  
>>The results I mentioned came from a pair of programs, one which  
>>plots the power pattern based on ground type, proximity, and frequency  
>>(verified from the diagrams in Kraus and Balanis), and the other program  
>>predicts signal strengths, based on transmitter location, solar flux, and  
>>antenna pattern (verified experimentally).  
>>  
>>I looked at about a dozen DX locations worldwide, from here in the Bay  
>>Area, with average (SSN=100) solar conditions. 30' is about minimum to  
>>prevent detuning the beam pattern. Moving from 30' to 60' resulted in an  
>>increase in signal strength from 2-6 db, with 5db being about average.  
>>Moving from 60' to 90' resulted in an additional -2 to 3 db (sometimes the  
>>optimal TOA was contained in a null) with about 2db being average.

Here are a few numbers I threw together with my software. The following was obtained using K6STI's A0 5.0 (MN based) software. The antenna modeled is a Hy-Gain 204BA four element yagi above what MN calls average ground at 14.0 MHz.

GAIN at WAVEANGLE

| Height | 5 Degrees | 7 Degrees | 9 Degrees |
|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|

|       |       |       |       |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|

|       |         |         |         |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|
| 30 ft | -.87 db | 1.86 db | 3.80 db |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|

|        |         |          |          |
|--------|---------|----------|----------|
| 60 ft  | 4.94 db | 7.43 db  | 9.50 db  |
| 90 ft  | 8.02 db | 10.10 db | 11.14 db |
| 120 ft | 9.91 db | 11.37 db | 11.37 db |

These gain figures seem to follow Paul's fairly well, although at lower angles the difference seems to be constantly near 5+ db from 30 to 60'. I guess the question becomes how much is a couple of db worth. Since I spend a lot of time in pileups or calling CQ contest I think 2 db is a big deal. I have spent many \$\$ for 2 db. I actually consider 80 feet about the correct height for a single 20 meter antenna. At that height your lowest angle lobe will cover most every waveangle 20 meters can propagate. I don't like 30 feet for 20 meters, at that height the maximum gain point of the lobe is probably 10 degrees higher than the band can propagate.

However it seems very difficult to calculate the actual waveangle of the arriving signal. I use Miniprop which also uses the sunspot number and location. It tells me that with a SSN = 100 the waveangle from here (Ft. Collins, CO) to Germany is 7 degrees. Unfortunately the waveangle changes quite a bit during the day so this isn't really very accurate. Miniprop gives the waveangle from here to UN (ex UL prefix) as 3 degrees. A figure which is so low that 20 meters probably can't propagate a signal at that angle.

I have yet to see a propagation program that actually can give a true waveangle at a certain SSN, date, time of day and band. If Minimuf.c can do this I would be very interested in a copy.

>>The optimal TOA for 40m is higher than for 20m, so one doesn't have to be >>up quite as far on 40 to achieve optimal TOA. In any event, even non-optimal >>TOA results in signals which are within a few db of optimal. This is clearly >>a non-linear process, and by the time you're up 60 feet, you've gotten most >>of the advantage. Depending on your location, your mileage may vary.

While it's true that the optimal angle goes up on 40m from 20m that doesn't help much. A 40 meter antenna still needs to be up higher than a 20m antenna in terms of feet. It just needs to be up a little less in terms of wavelength.

I wrote  
>Which programs were you using??

Paul Flaherty, N9FZX  
>>The propagation program is Dave Mill's minimuf.c, The antenna  
>>code is my own (gorf.c), which creates the gain profile which minimuf.c  
>>uses. Both of these should be available fairly soon from w6yx.stanford.edu.

Will look forward to seeing them.

I'll close with a couple of real on the air experiences:

A couple of years ago there was a DXpedition to Myanmar <sp? (ex Burma, from here 337 degrees at 8232 miles). This is a very tough path and the station XY0RR was using marginal antennas. I had just moved and only had up a Cushcraft A3 at 20 feet. One evening there was a one hour opening on 15 meters where stations all around my area using antennas from 70 to 120' reported XY0RR was about S5 (I know S units are relative, but he was a good Q5 copy and many db above S0). I could not hear him at all and never heard him through the entire opening! The waveangle must have been way down on the deck.

And for a real low angle experiment I got to operate W0UN's station in the 91 CQWW DX contest single band 10 meters. His two antennas were a single 8 element monoband yagi on a 48' boom at 40 feet (over 1 wavelength high) and a stack of four of the same eight element yagi antennas at 40/80/120/160' on a rotating tower. The best I can figure the stack has one lobe in the E-plane with all the signal below 8 degrees. In theory the stack has about 6 db gain over the single yagi. In the morning when the band opened to the Caribbean the signals were S0 to S1 on the single yagi and S7 to S9 on the stack (again S units, in db probably 25 to 40 db). The band was rather disturbed during the contest and while little Europe came in direct if was able to work lots of EU via backscatter with the stack. They generally CQed in my face when I tried the lower single antenna on scatter. In the evening I could work VK and ZLs for about 90 minutes after they were no longer heard on the single antenna. Even after they couldn't hear W6! However the stack was generally too high for average daytime propagation with the single antenna being often equal or a couple of db better. I realize this is a extreme case, most can't have a stack like this and 10 meters can support a couple of degrees lower angle than 20m, but it was very interesting to see what low angle can really do.

I could provide more examples for low angle but this is already so long most people probably won't get through it all :-).

73, Jay Kesterson K0GU

-----  
Date: Tue, 6 Jul 1993 19:58:39 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!  
Csli!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C9K996.7vL@fc.hp.com>, <1993Jul15.173752.2003@Csli.Stanford.EDU>, <C9r86y.D3x@fc.hp.com>  
Subject : Re: NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas

In <C9r86y.D3x@fc.hp.com> jayk@fc.hp.com (Jay Kesterson K0GU) writes:  
>These gain figures seem to follow Paul's fairly well, although at lower  
>angles the difference seems to be constantly near 5+ db from 30 to 60'.

Actually, that's half the battle. You still need to plug the MN results into something that will give you actual signal levels given various paths and arrival angles. Actually, being up above a certain height on 20 hurts you on some paths, as they arrive in the first null.

>I have yet to see a propagation program that actually can give a true  
>waveangle at a certain SSN, date, time of day and band. If Minimuf.c  
>can do this I would be very interested in a copy.

(Also don't forget that wave angle is heavily dependent on QTH!) Yes,  
"minimuf.c" (maybe the name should be changed) does just that, for multiple transmitter and receiver locations. It also predicts multipathing.

Followups to rec.radio.amateur.antennas, as we're now more technical than political...

--  
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----  
Date: Tue, 6 Jul 1993 21:21:52 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csli!  
paulf@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul16.042454.7553@serval.net.wsu.edu>,  
<1993Jul16.194631.9311@Csli.Stanford.EDU>, <C9rGAY.9KD@news.iastate.edu>  
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk out with a ham license...

In <C9rGAY.9KD@news.iastate.edu> wjturner@iastate.edu (William J Turner) writes:  
>How? I didn't listen in that time.

Hmmm, well, I suspect that you're in the minority then. Most people go out and buy a radio within a few days of passing the exam. I also urge my students to as well. Needless to say, this presupposes that one can buy radios without a license.

--  
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----  
Date: 6 Jul 1993 23:59:32 GMT  
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul05.195330.26682@anomaly.sbs.com>, <1993Jul16.042454.7553@serval.net.wsu.edu>, <1993Jul16.194631.9311@Csli.Stanford.EDU>.co  
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk out with a ham license...

> Secondly, the waiting period serves a very useful purpose. It forces a  
> new licensee to \*listen\* to the practice of amateur radio before they can  
> transmit, in order to learn how it's done.

It does no such thing. They're just as likely to not bother to even buy a radio until after their license comes in the mail. I would venture that most people who would listen before their license came are also the sort to have listened before they took the test. And there are certainly a large portion of amateurs who have been licensed for years and still don't know "how it's done."

-Ron

-----  
Date: Tue, 6 Jul 1993 20:44:57 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!  
news.iastate.edu!wjturner@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul05.195330.26682@anomaly.sbs.com>, <1993Jul16.042454.7553@serval.net.wsu.edu>, <1993Jul16.194631.9311@Csli.Stanford.EDU>  
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk out with a ham license...

In article <1993Jul16.194631.9311@Csli.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csli.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>Secondly, the waiting period serves a very useful purpose. It forces a  
>new licensee to \*listen\* to the practice of amateur radio before they can  
>transmit, in order to learn how it's done. A period of a few weeks allows  
>for a sampling of many different operating styles. There is, of course,  
>a limit to this as well (probably 3-4 weeks).

How? I didn't listen in that time.

--

Will Turner, NORDV -----

wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |  
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |  
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #218

\*\*\*\*\*